Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/594,306	MILANI COMPARETTI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICHAEL SIMITOSKI	2439
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>after final</u>		
(1) <u>MICHAEL SIMITOSKI</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>David Longo</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 27 June 2011	Time: <u>1 p.m.</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 39, 76,77		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Michael J Simitoski/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicant to discuss several claims. Claim 39 contained a potential lack of antecedent basis with "wherein said step of detecting information on application layer protocols". Further, a potential indefiniteness issue arose from claim 76's "associated therewith". Lastly, the Examiner proposed to Applicant that claim 77 may be construed as not further limiting and thus an improper dependent claim. All of the above issues were resolved in the attached, agreed-upon Examiner amendment.